



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Clu
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,838	09/10/2003	John F. Gabower	020843-000410US	5171
20350	7590	07/09/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			NGO, HUNG V	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EIGHTH FLOOR			2831	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,838	GABOWER, JOHN F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hung V. Ngo	2831	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 23,25,26,28,32,34,46,49 and 50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34, 46, 49, 50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23, 25, 26, 28, 32, 34, 46, 49, 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obayashi et al (US 4,749,625) in view of Mollet et al (US 4,785,136).

Re claim 23, Obayashi et al discloses a shaped polymer substrate comprised of a metalized polymer substrate (2, 2a, 2b), wherein the shaped polymer substrate is substantially conductive (col. 11, lines 14-20); and

a conductive material (1) on at least one surface of the shaped polymer substrate;

wherein the shaped polymer substrate comprises polyvinyl chloride, polycarbonate, polybutylene terephthalate, or polyethylene terephthalate glycol (col. 11, lines 14-20),

the conductive coating having 1-50 microns in thickness (col. 4, lines 1-5).

Re claim 25, wherein the conductive material comprises aluminum (col. 2, lines 34-38).

Re claim 26 wherein the conductive material comprises a substantially uniform thickness over at least one surface of the shaped polymer substrate (Fig 2).

Re claims 32, 46, the limitations of "grinding, re-extruding", "recycle" have been considered, but does not result in a structural difference. The presence of process limitations in product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to that product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965).

Re claims 49, 50, the conductive material made of copper, or nickel (col. 2, lines 34-38).

The teaching of Obayashi et al as discussed above does not disclose the thermoformed shape polymer substrate being shaped to having an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component (re claims 23, 28, 32, 34), the shaped polymer substrate comprising an inner surface, an outer surface, edges, a first surface, a plurality of sidewalls having a first end and a second end, the first end of each of the sidewalls are coupled to the first surface, wherein the sidewalls extend at an angle from the first surface, wherein the first surface and sidewalls define an enclosure portion, a peripheral flange coupled to the second end of the sidewalls that extends around the enclosure portion (re claims 28, 34).

Mollet et al discloses thermoformed shape substrate (40) being shaped to having an enclosure for enclosing an electronic component (Fig 4) comprising an inner surface, an outer surface, edges, a first surface (34), a plurality of sidewalls having a first end and a second end, the first end of each of the sidewalls are coupled to the first surface, wherein the sidewalls extend at an angle from the first surface, wherein the first surface and sidewalls define an enclosure portion (Fig 4), a peripheral flange (28) coupled to the

second end of the sidewalls that extends around the enclosure portion. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the structure of Obayashi et al by employing thermoformed the enclosure with the first surface, inner and outer surfaces, edges, the plurality of sidewalls, the peripheral flange for the purpose of forming an EMI shielding cover for electronic components (computer).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 23, 28, 32, 34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung V. Ngo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean A. Reichard can be reached on (571) 272-2800 EXT 31. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HVN
06-29-07

Hung V Ngo

**HUNG V. NGO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**